

In re Patent Application of
Stephen E. Frazier
Serial No. 09/923,764
Filed August 7, 2001

C1
Sub D1
contacting the activated carbon with an aqueous solution having up to about 10% by weight of an enhancer comprising potassium iodide; and drying the activated carbon by a first heating at a temperature of less than about 130° C, followed by a second heating at a temperature of at least 130° C.

Sub E2
65. The process of Claim 64, wherein contacting is for a time sufficient to saturate the activated carbon with the enhancer.

C2
66. The process of Claim 64, wherein drying is accomplished by heating without reaching ignition temperature.

C3
Sub E3
75. The process of Claim 64, wherein the enhancer consists of potassium iodide.

Please enter new claims 76-79.

C4
Sub D2
76. A process of making enhanced activated carbon having an increased capacity for adsorbing chlorine in potable water, comprising:

contacting the activated carbon with an aqueous solution having up to about 10% by weight of an enhancer comprising potassium iodide;
drying the activated carbon at a temperature of less than about 130° C until visibly dry; and

In re Patent Application of
Stephen E. Frazier
Serial No. 09/923,764
Filed August 7, 2001

C4 *sub 77*
~~enhancing the activity of the activated carbon by heating at a temperature of at least 130° C for a time sufficient for producing enhanced activation.~~

sub 78
~~77. The process of Claim 64, wherein contacting is for a time sufficient to saturate the activated carbon with the enhancer.~~

sub 79
~~78. The process of Claim 64, wherein drying and enhancing are accomplished by heating without reaching ignition temperature.~~

sub 79
~~79. The process of Claim 64, wherein the enhancer consists of potassium iodide.~~

Remarks

Applicant respectfully points out that the cited reference by Storp et al. (US4,075,282) does not explicitly teach drying of the activated carbon, as recognized by the Examiner. The Examiner, however, takes the position that drying the activated carbon is inferred in the discussion by Storp et al. Even if the Examiner's position were correct, Applicant points out that Storp et al. do not describe or suggest processing the activated carbon at two temperature ranges, as disclosed and claimed in the instant application. Accordingly, Applicant believes that Storp et al. cannot be said to anticipate or make the claimed invention obvious.